



In Remembrance, 2018

On 21st century Geological & Economical/Cyber Warfare

Nearly a decade and a half after the Iraq-WMD fiasco, we are once again asked to believe in dubious intelligence assessments.

“To bring the pressure of war to bear upon the whole population, and not merely upon the armies in the field, is the very spirit of modern warfare.”

Alfred Thayer Mahan, November 1910

Make no mistake about it! **a cyber-economic war** is already underway. Recent revelations of Russian, Chinese and North Korean hacking should not come as any surprise as we have covered these risks for years. Yes! we are in a genuine cyber-economic war but this fact has been hijacked by **a very costly political narrative**.

A trade war with China... an ever-escalating cyber war... an escalating war on cash - creating chaos and upending personal freedoms under the guise of **counter-terrorism**. **Financial-elitists** are working to make cash illegal; already, you have to show an ID just to put cash into your own account. This effort has accelerated under **negative interest rate policies...** but will doubtlessly increase in the foreseeable future as with the digitalization of all transactions. This means we will all be increasingly monitored and, in the case of terrorism or drug trafficking, this may seem a good idea, but **a government willing to control all aspects of our lives** is tantamount to **economic slavery**. And then, *of course*, there are the **risks of hacking and currency manipulations**.

There are really two risks here: Firstly, **competitive devaluations** designed to make those nations with the strongest currency non-competitive and to suffer under deflation. This **ultimately** will collapse into **global depression** - we are already seeing a heavy currency impact on American exporters, spiking trade deficits... and, make no mistake, some of this activity is purposeful **economic warfare**.

We know the dollar can be manipulated. In fact, the criminal bankster cabal of **Goldman-Sachs** just paid a big fine for doing so. And, we know **that high frequency trading of currencies** pose other risks...such as “payment systems under cyber-hacking attacks.” We also know **that** China and Russia have been plotting de-dollarization... encouraging foreigners to dump American bonds and look for alternatives to the dollar as reserve currency. So, there is a **risk of a too strong dollar**. There is also the **risk of de-dollarization**. A third risk is that the system itself collapses. With drastic changes around the world like **BREXIT** and **populist resurgence** [] people are clearly demanding change.

An upheaval in the monetary system is inevitable. It could happen at some point in the new year – and **the inevitability of a Third World War may be about currencies**.

Despite imposed sanctions, **North Korea** has built and tested **nuclear weapons**. They have also been known to **counterfeit fiat-dollars, hack our systems**, and **launch satellites** which just might carry **EMP weaponry**.

The Rothschildean “Crown” & British-ZOG Globalist Strategy of Economic Warfare

As national economies become increasingly dependent on and intertwined with cyberspace, cybersecurity moves steadily up the defense agenda.

Based on “Brits-Krieg: The Strategy of Economic Warfare” by Nicholas Lambert: (Published 16 October 2017; Carnegie Endowment for International Peace).

While important to understand **the macroeconomic aspects of globalization**; we must not lose sight of those **microeconomic social aspects** which are **arguably of greater strategic importance**. Globalization—the phenomenon by which **national economies became entwined with and progressively subsumed within the international economy** is more than **a disembodied large-scale economic phenomenon - as national economies become increasingly dependent on and intertwined with cyberspace**, the topic of **cybersecurity** moves steadily up the defense agenda. Now **critical to the global economy** on which societies depend, **cyber systems are a major factor in national defense and international communications network stability**.

Like globalization, **cyber warfare** is a multifaceted yet amorphous subject. To be clear, **economic warfare**, as envisioned in 1914, was not analogous to **the Allies’ nefarious strategic bombing campaign in Germany**, from 1942. The differences are fundamental. Whereas **strategic bombing targeted the ability of the State to make war** and could work only through attrition, **economic warfare targeted the enemy’s society by deranging its national economy** with the object of rapidly undermining the legitimacy of and domestic support for the enemy State. Similarly, whereas in strategic bombing **civilian casualties are typically viewed as collateral damage**, **in economic warfare civilians are the target**. *The most commonly employed historical example is the Allies’ strategic bombing campaign in World War II; less common are the German U-boat campaigns of the First and Second World Wars and the US submarine campaign against Japan during 1942–45.*

Here, the term **“economic warfare”** is not referencing bombing ball-bearing plants or oil refineries (done with precision or otherwise), as in the Second World War, nor even the **interdiction of global supply chains**, as in the German and US submarine campaigns; these forms of economic attack were all comparatively limited in scope, intended to create bottlenecks and choke points in critical-path supply chains in the hope of producing systemic consequences. Put another way, economic warfare transcended specific systems; it was not intended to be systems specific but society specific: To be more precise, by deliberately targeting the enemy’s society (through the economy) rather than the state.

Whereas **strategic bombing targeted the ability of the State to make war** and could work only through **attrition...** *on the other hand, economic warfare targets the enemy’s society by deranging its national economy* with the object of **rapidly undermining the legitimacy of and domestic support for the enemy state**. Similarly, whereas in **strategic bombing civilian casualties**

The “fake news” War on Free Thought and Free Speech.

Certainly there is **false information propagated on the internet...** but the response has been to demand strict controls. Facebook, Amazon and Alphabet (i.e. Google) - to name a few - have proclaimed that they will judge content and determine its accuracy on our behalf. The problem is that these “fact checkers” are **almost exclusively left-wing commies**. And, those “newspeak liars” who control the information we receive shall soon attempt to control everything...

Of course, there is **also the serious risk of foreign information manipulation**. This is the beginning of **a new global war** for what we think and believe.

Continuing **“Arab Oil Wars”** have the Middle East in turmoil – and it appears **that Saudi Arabia** has lost the oil war gambit. Now, the **so-called allies** in the region appear to be at risk to further uprisings. The battle between Sunni and Shia will no doubt continue, as will the battle between extremists and those who want to modernize. The **global energy supply** could well be collateral damage. This would prove extremely disruptive to the global economy.

Moreover, there is the ever-present risk of **grid failure from EMP solar storms and other space weather events**, at least until we properly protect our electric grid. Whether natural or man-made, a grid failure would devastate the global economy.

The **risks of a stock market crash** are greater than ever before. Of course, just as with a grid failure, the market could crash from natural causes or purposed manipulation. The manipulation could be cyber, high-frequency trading, or other subversion. And, beyond direct and obvious attacks, there is the risk of **continued undermining of our technology and intellectual property**. We already know **that** the once respected **IBM ThinkPads** were purchased by China’s **Lenovo** – **a multinational technology company with headquarters in Beijing**: Now, the **Pentagon** warns **that** these computers may pose **a spying threat**. The **5G internet-of-things**, **such as toasters and other household appliances, like our cell phones, televisions and automobiles**, gives the **globalist “shadow government”** even more control over our everyday lives... and the “Hunger Games” possession of our progeny as corporate slaves proves more-and-more real.

Then answered all the people, and said, “His blood **be** on us, and on our children.”
Gospel of Matthew 27:25

The problem is **that** just as we are learning we can’t trust our technology, **our society has become technology dependent**.

:Pip:Argot of the family Kanata
Editor-in-Chief of the New Caledonian Broadside and Black Thorn Publications

are typically viewed as collateral damage, in economic warfare civilians were the target.

The **employment of cyber warfare to assist combat forces** is operational, while **targeting critical economic infrastructure is a precision attack on physical assets**. But could not a State use **cyber means as a weapon of mass destruction or disruption**, targeting an enemy’s confidence - **as well as its infrastructure** - with the aim of causing enemy civilians to put political pressure on their government?

The **world economy** was relatively more globalized (less autarkic) during the fifty-year period **prior to the outbreak of the First World War** than it was during the fifty years afterward. During **the first era of globalization**, as in **the stability of today’s national economies and the international economy rested on the free movement around the globe of goods, money, knowledge, and information**. The flow of physical goods over the seas also hinges on a parallel yet separate flow of **real-time information via undersea cables**. Accurate and instantaneous information relaying **details of supply, demand, and prices** essential to all businesses, and **especially to the financial services industry** that facilitates **the movement of commerce** with ever-increasing velocity. The **flow of information parallels the international flow of goods and services** being **integral to economic systems**.

The **advent of new military technologies** changed the ways in which wars could be fought, but more fundamentally, **the transformation of the world economic system introduced changes in the nature of war itself**. **Fiber-optic submarine cables** are the **international digital trade routes** of the 21st century. And thus, any disruptions to the **submarine cable global network** can have **significant impact on the flow of digital information around the world**, with severe consequences for the world economy. In particular, **the development of the cable network impacted the structure of the world economy in ways that presented multiple strategic challenges and opportunities**. Not only could militaries use the cable network to achieve **unprecedented speeds of communication** but, **more important**, businessmen and consumers around the world **also** came to depend on the smooth functioning of the cable network. Interrupting the network could **therefore** impact civilians—not just their governments or armed forces—more directly and more rapidly than had previously been possible. **The very parameters of warfare were changing**.

The development of **the financial services industry**, in conjunction with **the communications revolution** [] as **the cost of transportation fell and the global communications network spread**, merchants looked farther afield for

produce to buy and resources to exploit. As they did so, one by one, distant local markets became subsumed into the single world market.

Continued verso ...

“[By 1914], there was hardly a village or town anywhere on the globe whose prices were not influenced by distant foreign markets, whose infrastructure was not financed by foreign capital, whose engineering, manufacturing, and even business skills were not imported from abroad, or whose labor markets were not influenced by the absence of those who had emigrated or the presence of strangers had immigrated.”

Globalization and History, by Kevin O’Rourke and Jeffrey Williamson, p.2.

In effect, *commercial supply chains had begun to stretch around the world*, with *national and local economies* growing ever more dependent on each other and on *the global trading system*. The solution to *the increase in business risk that accompanied globalization* was found in *a new financial instrument* called a “**futures contract**,” *also known as* a “derivative.” *The primary purpose of derivatives is to mitigate risk caused by likely price fluctuations*; it is only a *secondary purpose to facilitate commercial trade*, though, *in fact*, they do and indeed are necessary to the conduct of business in a *globalized economic world*. Derivatives allowed merchants to project their future costs and revenues with much greater certainty. Thus, the *derivatives market was the result of microeconomic calculations by merchants* about the risk—itsself a result of the increased complexity of a globalized market—that they were willing to tolerate. Despite *intense opposition from farmers*, futures markets remained in operation because *no credible alternative system for managing risk could be devised*. The excesses of the system, such as *rampant corruption* and *market manipulation*, are *undeniable*.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, various commentators with an interest in *strategic affairs and political economy* began to speculate *that* the ever-growing interdependencies and interconnections between the great industrial powers must reduce the likelihood of war between them. Such thoughts sprang not from idealism but from widespread perceptions of brittleness within *urban-industrial societies* and the belief that the new global economic system were inherently fragile and susceptible to shock. In the extreme, some argued warfare that dislocated global trade, and the world economic system, would be so catastrophic as to raise *the specter of social collapse*. Theoretically, warfare (certainly protracted warfare) would then be an existentially self-defeating proposition for anyone contemplating it.

“The future of war is not fighting, but famine, not the slaying of men, but the bankruptcy of nations and the break-up of the whole social organization.”

Ivan Bloch, Polish railway tycoon turned military theorist;
“*The Future of War in Its Technical, Economic, and Political Relations: Is War Now Impossible*”; ed. William Stead (New York: Doubleday & McClure, 1899), xvii. See *also* xxxviii, xlix, 179–82, 242.

Standing at *the epicenter of the global trading system*, at *the hub of the global communications network*, Rothschild-controlled Great Britain (i.e. “The Crown”) appeared to have more to lose than most from a *war-induced meltdown of the global economy*. Yet from *about* 1901, Admiralty planners began toying with the strategic possibilities of deliberately deranging the global economy to undermine an enemy’s socioeconomic stability. In effect, they *weaponized of the global trading system*. They believed that in such an eventuality Britain would suffer relatively less than other powers, especially Germany, because Britain’s dependence on the smooth functioning of that system was matched by its considerable control over the levers of the system, whereas Germany’s was not. In effect, Britain was in a position to deny Germany access to world markets while retaining access for itself.

The Royal Navy was the most powerful navy in the world, with *an unrivaled capability to exert direct control over seaborne trade*. Moreover, *the Admiralty possessed the most sophisticated information- and intelligence-gathering network in the world*, as well as an *understanding of how to leverage this relative advantage into global situational awareness*. Most prominently, *British companies dominated the physical and virtual infrastructure of the global trading system*. The *cable networks strung across the globe*, the *maritime insurance and reinsurance industry*, the *banks financing international sales*, the *discount market for bills of*

exchange, and, *of course*, the *companies that owned the merchantmen who transported goods and staples across the oceans—all* were based in the City of London.* In the eyes of British defense planners, this dominance meant *that* the British government could potentially wield *effective monopoly control over the critical infrastructure on which the global trading system depended*.

Less well known are the *close links between the Admiralty and key international companies* such as Lloyds of London (insurance), the Baltic Exchange (freight forwarding), the Eastern Telegraph Company (cables), *etc...* In modern parlance, there were *numerous private-public partnerships in the sharing of information*. Naval planners recognized *that the nervous and circulatory system of the global economy increasingly depended on the sea and in ways that were not entirely obvious to others*. Whereas *sea communications*—traditionally the target of naval pressure—had once been limited to merchant ships carrying goods and letters, by the early-twentieth century they *also* encompassed *the networked international financial services industry*, which had been *built on the global undersea cable communications grid*.

Against this background, *then*, to exploit the changed strategic environment to Britain’s benefit, Royal Navy planners conceived *the strategy of economic warfare*. The essence of the proposed strategy was *for Britain to exploit the natural economic and financial forces set in motion by the outbreak of war*, forces that were expected to cascade though the economies of all nations and leave *widespread chaos* in their wake. In other words, Rothschild’s Britain would take certain naval (and non-naval) measures calculated to channel and intensify the magnitude of the inevitable and inescapable economic shock expected to strike the global economy.

Weaponizing the infrastructure of global trade would translate into a shock—not attritional—attack on an enemy society. The means and ends of this plan were *also very different from a traditional blockade* (the term most often used to describe Britain’s wartime economic warfare campaign). **Blockades** predated the globalized world economy and were *based on older trading practices and international law*. More-so, it worked by *targeting an enemy state’s revenues* through the interdiction of physical goods... but it could work only slowly. *The new economic warfare*, by *contrast*, targeted an enemy’s society (not state) psychologically (not physically) - and it could work quickly.

“When Britain declared war on Germany at 11:00 p.m. on 4 August 1914, the global economy was already in disarray. The mere expectation of war during the previous week caused a virtual cessation of world trade, an impact more dramatic than even the most pessimistic commentator had forecast. By July 31st, every stock exchange around the world (including Wall Street) had shut its doors. There was a global liquidity crisis. Banks recalled their loans. Foreign exchange was simply unavailable though on the gray markets in New York, sterling was selling for \$6.00 (up from par \$4.86). In London, *meanwhile*, the accepting houses that funded international trade were unable to meet their obligations and technically were bankrupt. The British government was compelled to step in and underwrite the entire stock of outstanding bills of exchange (in the world), thus increasing the national debt obligation overnight by *approximately* three-quarters.

“*Planning Armageddon: British Economic Warfare and the First World War*”
by Nicholas A. Lambert, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

In October 1914, aware of evasions and growing outright defiance by domestic interests, combined with mounting pressure from powerful neutrals (especially the Woodrow Wilson administration), the economic warfare strategy was aborted. As a result, *the British were compelled to wage war in ways they had previously agreed were undesirable, unthinkable, unworkable, and even fatal to their own interests*.

In the event of a future major conflict, waging economic warfare within the context of a very different global economic structure would be, as it was a century ago, quite different in its character from anything experienced before. It thus behooves us now to devote serious and persistent thinking to the subject.

Fukishima Doomed Our Planet

According to Japanese officials, the government is pouring *approximately* 300 tonnes of radioactive water into the Pacific Ocean every day... that’s about 71,895 gallons – enough to fill an Olympic-size swimming pool every eight days! What’s worse, it appears that **Strontium 90** is also coming out in the water proportionally at a higher level than **Cesium 137**. Strontium 90 is an element known as “the bone seeker” – it deposits itself in bone and bone marrow resulting in cancers later in life. In a related study, doctors studied hundreds of thousands of babies’ teeth and found that children born in St-Louis in 1963 had levels of Strontium that were fifty times higher than those of children born in 1950... before atomic testing. Fukushima is dumping out so much strontium that the effects won’t be seen for decades.

Is it possible that we’re not getting the full story on the threat from Fukushima? Some people believe [] the science of global warming is speculative and that elites are using climate change as the means to maintain the existing social order! Is it possible that global leaders in Japan and elsewhere are manipulating the data? As with climate science in order to satisfy a pre-determined government agenda? Its not as crazy as one might think.

A Japanese journalist made an incredible claim stating that Japan had secretly been supplied weapon’s-grade uranium by Israel – with the approval of the U.S. But, when Japan offered to enrich uranium for Iran and to recognize Palestine’s right to Statehood... that was the last straw! Shortly thereafter, an Israeli firm Magna BSP won a contract to install massive security systems at Fukushima... and, some say, it was at this time that they installed the Stuxnet virus - a malicious computer worm – designed to cripple the plant. Twelve days before the tsunami hit these all returned to Israel. The theory is “there was a minor earthquake, and using that as an opportunity a nuclear device was exploded offshore to create the tsunami and all the damage.” But, looking at all the other cities around this 9.0 Richter scale earthquake, you cannot find any earthquake damage photos anywhere!

Two weeks after the Fukushima incident, Japan started passing legislation called the “State’s Secrets Act” making it illegal for public servants to disclose information on proscribed matters related to government security, including Fukushima. Japan then began prosecuting journalists who covered the story. But what could they be covering up? One lawmaker says it was a *coup de tête* by politicians and bureaucrats. Even more frightening, one Japanese journalist was mysteriously found dead on 29 September 2013; **Masaki Iwaji** was the only journalist reporting about the long-term effects of exposure to radiation at Fukushima... so, it turns out what they might be covering up is even bigger than anyone can imagine.

Now, the China Syndrome refers to a scenario where a molten nuclear reactor core burns its way through the basement of the power plant all the way to the center of the earth and beyond (i.e. to China). Realistically, it could burn its way through the soil into the water table and create a lot of problems... and this nightmare scenario might be what has happened at Fukushima.

